REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **29 January 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-27 and 29-33. Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ramanathan (USPN 6,948,060, hereinafter "Ramanathan").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 12, and 23 were rejected as being anticipated by Ramanathan. Applicant respectfully points out that Ramanathan discloses a system for monitoring encrypted communications over a network in accordance with an established network policy (see Ramanathan, Abstract, col. 1, lines 17-20, col. 2, lines 34-48, col. 3, lines 18-22, and FIG. 2). A network policy, defined and distributed by a policy administrator, specifies rules for communication between network elements. These elements may only communicate using the rules specified in the received policy. Thus, the network policy establishes a priori the rules by which a pair of network elements may communicate (see Ramanathan, col. 3, lines 1-17, and FIG. 3, items 300 and 310).

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention provide a system for secure **communications between ad hoc components without the two components having prior knowledge of each other**. The system enables arbitrary components to securely communicate by dynamically providing each other with controller objects (see page 3, paragraph [0011], lines 20-24, and page 20, paragraph [0059]-page 21, paragraph [0060] of the instant application). Note that Ramanthan actually teaches away from embodiments of the present invention, because the Ramanthan system **requires prior knowledge of the devices**, i.e., the network policy, to function properly. In other words, the Romanthan system **cannot work with ad hoc devices**, whereas the present inventive system facilitates secure communications among ad hoc devices.

There is nothing within Ramanthan, either explicit or implicit, which enables secure communications between two components without prior knowledge of each other. Instead, Ramanathan discloses monitoring communications between two components that are communicating according to an a priori network policy.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 23 to clarify that the present invention teaches a second component securely controlling a first component in a network without having prior knowledge of the first component. These amendments find support on page 3, paragraph [0011], lines 20-24, and page 20, paragraph [0059]-page 21, paragraph [0060] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-5 and 7-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-16 and 18-22, which depend upon claim 12, and claims 24-27 and 29-33, which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Shun Yao/
           Shun Yao
           Registration No. 59,242

Date: 23 July 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com